

Now, the Senator mentions this \$1 million for families. That is money that may be claimed—may be claimed. We paid \$30 million for the people who came in and identified the two sons of Saddam Hussein. It may not be spent at all. It will only be spent if these people come in and disclose people we want to pick up that are worth the cost. What is the cost? Moving them out of the country forever. That is taking people and buying them a new life somewhere else because they have exposed themselves to death because they disclosed the location of some of these people.

I am appalled the Army would ask for this addition. We made an agreement with them. We took money from the other three services. And someone in the Army is going to answer to me. If it is really true someone in the Army went to the Senator from Connecticut and demanded more money than we gave them, after we gave them \$26 billion in the regular bill, gave them another \$952 million, almost a billion we took from other services, to come in and make this demand at this time, it is absolutely nonsense.

Anyone who comes back, I hope they understand they have been brought back to answer a political amendment. I am going to move to table it when the time comes. The Senator from Connecticut is my friend, but I have to tell you, to bring back people who have already gone home, some of them who missed planes in order to vote on this amendment at this time, is an absolute absurdity.

How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty seconds.

Mr. STEVENS. I will reserve it.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has 7 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the Army did not come to me. This is an official briefing provided by the United States Army Comptroller to both the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees. I am just reading what they said. They didn't make an attempt to get in touch with me. Their briefing materials speak for them. They say that there is a requirement for \$420 million to fund the ordnance disposal on the battlefields still out there, and, in addition, there is a shortfall in Army equipment. That is it plain and simple.

What the committee has said is: You can only do one or the other, but you will not have enough money to do both.

I am suggesting you ought to be able to do both. To provide the \$300 million, that is great, that helps. But the \$300 million doesn't cover the \$420 million for the battlefield clearance and for the shortfalls that occurred in this equipment. This is not about allowing service members to go out and buy shirts and gloves simply that they like. This is about equipping our soldiers with the most effective gear available to protect them from hostile fire as well

as from the intense desert climate. I am not arbitrarily making up figures. The suggestion here is we come up with an additional \$322 million to cover both circumstances—that is, the battlefield clearance as well as the equipment—and pay for it, by the way, not by readjusting moneys within the defense needs but in the reconstruction side of this supplemental request, that you can do away or at least delay, if you want, the idea of buying computers at \$3,000 a copy, a witness protection program at \$50 million for 50 families, and whether or not you can cut down prison construction from \$400 million to \$200 million. With my amendment, there is still plenty of funding to implement the reconstruction plans of the Coalition Provisional Authority.

I don't know why this is so controversial. Why don't we just accept this amendment? If I did it by not going into these reconstruction accounts, they might take it. But because I am talking about a witness protection program and ridiculously high-priced computers and going after excessive prison construction, which I think is hardly an emergency, all of a sudden this is a bad amendment and I am a dreadful guy for making folks come back and miss a plane.

I don't want a soldier out there getting hurt because they don't have the right equipment. I didn't make this up. The Army didn't come to me specifically. They made this case on September 26, the source was a briefing provided to Congress' defense committees by the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Financial Management and Comptroller, entitled, "FY04 Supplemental Request for the Global War on Terrorism: The Army At War." That is where it comes from. I appreciate what the committee did with \$300 million. But the committee report says you have to make a choice: Clearing up the battlefield or provide funding for soldiers' equipment. And I don't think the Army ought to be put in that position. I don't think you ought to ask them to have to make that choice. That is the reason for the amendment.

Again, I am sorry people have to come back and vote. That is not my intention. But I, in good conscience, believe this is a responsible amendment. I would have thought it might be accepted instead of making a lot more out of this than has to be the case. We all agree they ought to get the equipment. Why not just agree to the amendment? If you want to table the amendment, put people on record saying they would rather spend money on a witness protection program at \$1 million a family in Iraq when the average family makes \$2,200 a year, you explain that to the American taxpayer, why an Iraqi family would get \$1 million in witness protection. That is ridiculous.

Spending \$3,000 for a computer and \$400 million to create new prison operations over there is not an emergency need. You make the choice whether or not you think that is more important

than seeing these young people get what they need. I stand by the amendment. It is the right thing to do.

I yield back the remainder of my time, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. STEVENS. The yeas and nays are not ordered until I speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are in order at this time.

Mr. DODD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. STEVENS. I have not yielded back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not a motion to table. The yeas and nays can be requested at any time.

Mr. DODD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At the moment there is not a sufficient second.

The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, that is good for me. If you want to have a quorum, go right ahead. Go right ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has the floor.

Mr. DODD. I renew my request. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I want to point out the Army has all of this money in this supplemental without any directions in the bill. The line items the Senator mentions are specified in our report. They have entire discretion to use any money in this bill for the moneys he has asked for. But he wants to take it from the other money. This is a duplicitous amendment to take money from the second part of the bill and put it in the first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska's time has expired.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to table has been made.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on the motion to table amendment No. 1817.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS), the Senator from Florida (Mr.